

China mathematical Scandal(3)

<http://wikibin.org/artic;es/jiang-chun-Xuan.html>

China refused to recognize the proofs of Fermat last theorem by Jiang

**An Open Letter to Prof. Yang Zhen-ning, The Shao Yi-fu Science Award Fund Committee,
and to The China Mathematics Society**

致杨振宁教授、邵逸夫科学奖基金会与中国数学学会的公开信

2005-08-12

I do not have the sufficient mathematical knowledge to judge major mathematical problems, i.e. Fermat's Last Theorem (FLT), Riemann's Hypothesis (RH), Jiang Chun-xuan's proof of FLT, Wiles's in question proof of FLT, or Jiang Chun-xuan's disproof RH, etc. Accordingly, in my writings involving Jiang Chun-xuan and his mathematical achievements, I have been very careful only to quote comments by others on Jiang's work, including positive appraising remarks, and negative discrediting remarks, and raising questions about such conflicting remarks about Jiang and his work, and not stating any mathematical judgments of Jiang's work.

我没有足够的数学知识判断重大数学问题，如费马大定理 (FLT)、黎曼假设 (RH) 等，以及蒋春暄对于 FLT 的证明、威尔斯 (Wiles) 对 FLT 有问题的证明、蒋春暄对于 RH 的否定。为此，在我涉及蒋春暄及其数学成就的文章中，我非常注意仅引证其它人对于蒋春暄工作的评论，包括积极赞扬的看法与负面贬低的看法，并对于有关蒋春暄及其工作的看法为何如此冲突提出问题，而对于蒋春暄的工作不表示任何数学上的判断。

However, based on my understanding of Jiang Chun-xuan's analysis and the preprint of his new paper "Disproof Of Wiles' Proof For Fermat's Last Theorem", I believe that I am in the position to make some important remarks, which provide strong support to Jiang's disproof of "Wiles's Proof For Fermat's Last Theorem" as follows:

然而，基于我对于蒋春暄的分析及其新的文章“对威尔斯费马大定理证明之否定”预印本的理解，我相信我有条件提出一些重要的看法，可以对蒋春暄否定“威尔斯费马大定理证明”的文章给予重要支持：

I must, however, emphasize that my remarks below are based on one most critical fact stated by Jiang: **In Wiles' proof of FLT, Wiles has included RH and/or deductions from RH, as an**

essential part of Wiles' proof of FLT.

然而我首先必须强调,我下边的看法基于蒋春暄确认的一项最为重要的事实:在威尔斯对于 FLT 的证明中,作为威尔斯对于 FLT 的证明不可缺少的一部分,威尔斯包括了 RH 和 / 或 RH 的推论。

If this is true, which most mathematicians can easily judge, then I can also judge that **Wiles' proof of FLT is false.**

如果这是事实,这是大部分数学家很容易可以判断的情况,我则也可以判断威尔斯对于 FLT 的证明是错误的。

But, it is false first not because Jiang Chun-xuan has disproved RH, but false first **because Wiles' proof of FLT has included RH and/or deductions from RH, as an essential part of Wile's proof of FLT.**

但是,威尔斯对于 FLT 的证明之所以错误,首先并非因为蒋春暄已经否定黎曼假设;而首先因为在威尔斯对于 FLT 的证明中,作为威尔斯对于 FLT 证明的不可缺少的一部分,威尔斯包括了 RH 和 / 或 RH 的推论。

The logic of this judgment can very easily be explained with a simple example as follows:

做出这种判断的逻辑可以用一个简单的例子解释如下:

If a 50-floor building, with its construction strictly following the design by a famous architect of the world is completed. It looks most impressive from its outside appearance, and the internal functions of the building also is great.

如果一个 50 层大厦,严格依照一位世界知名的建筑设计师的设计建造完成。它的外观令人最为印象深刻,大厦内部的功能也非常好。

Before going into use, according to local regulations, the building must be carefully checked and appraised; making sure the building in all aspects meets all the required quality standards and safety norms.

投入使用前,根据当地的规定,必须对这座大厦进行仔细的检查与鉴定,确保大厦在所有方面符合所要求的所有质量标准和安全规范。

The appraising department finds that almost everything meets the required quality standards and safety norms for such buildings, but with one exception: The foundation of the building is built with a questionable material that to this date has not passed the also required appraisal.

从事鉴定的部门发现几乎所有方面均符合所要求的质量标准与安全规范,但是有一个例

外：大厦的地基以一种至今为止还没有通过所要求的鉴定的有问题的材料建成。

This means that it is not clear if this material meets all the required quality standards and safety norms and can be used as a safe foundation construction material; or if this material does not meet some of the required quality standards and safety norms and thus can not be used as a safe and acceptable foundation construction material.

这意味着, 这种材料是否符合所要求的所有质量标准和安全规范以及是否可以用来作为一种安全的可以验收的地基建造材料至今并不清楚; 这种材料是否不符合某些质量标准和安全规范因而不是是一种可以验收的安全的地基建造材料也不清楚。

In such a case, can we allow this 50-floor building pass the appraisal and start to use this building? Absolutely not!

在这种情况下, 我们是否能够允许这座 50 层的大厦通过鉴定投入使用? 绝对不可以!

In such a case, the only way for this world famous architect to get the building pass the appraisal, is to **first prove the above mentioned foundation material also meets all the required quality standards and safety norms and can be used as a safe and acceptable foundation construction material**, otherwise, the safety of such a 50-floor building contains serious FALSE, its' safety is still in question, and for such reason the building, however great it is in all other aspects, it definitely can not pass the appraisal, and is not safe to be used.

在这种情况下, 只有一种途径能够让这个世界知名的建筑师使这个大厦通过鉴定: **首先证明上述地基建造材料也符合所要求的所有质量标准与安全规范可以用来作为一种安全的可以验收的地基建造材料**; 否则, 这样一个 50 层大厦包括有严重的错误, 它的安全性仍然有问题, 为此这座的使用不安全因而不能使用, 无论它在所有其它方面多么好, 它肯定在鉴定中不能通过, 使用也不安全。

Regardless how loud and how many members of the world architectural community, friends and adorers of this famous architect shout that the above 50-floor building one of the greatest achievements of architect of the world, and how many glorious rewards they award to this architect, there is no way to change the fact that this 50-floor building contains serious FALSE, its' safety is still in question and therefore can not be used.

无论世界建筑界多少成员以及这位知名建筑师的朋友们和崇拜者们以多么大的声响叫喊这座 50 层大厦是对世界建筑学最伟大的成就之一, 以及他们向这位建筑师颁发多少显赫的奖, 都无法改变这样一个 50 层大厦包括有严重的错误、它的安全性仍然有问题, 并为此

使用不安全的事实。

Similarly, although many mathematicians, or even most mathematicians, of the world mathematical community believe that the Riemann's Hypothesis (RH) is correct, but they all publicly admit that they or anyone has not been able to satisfactory prove RH; a few mathematicians even have expressed in writing their great concern of the slight possibility that RH might be wrong, and the serious consequences to the number theory and its community if and when RH might be proved wrong.

与此类似, 尽管世界数学界许多数学家, 甚至绝大部分数学家, 相信黎曼假设 (RH) 正确, 但是都公开承认他们或任何人都没有能够令人满意地证明 RH; 个别数学家甚至在文章中表示过对于 RH 可能错误的较小可能性的担心, 以及 RH 万一被证明错误时对数论和数论界造成的严重后果的担心。

Under the above situation, once Jiang Chun-xuan has satisfactory shown that **Wiles' proof of FLT has included RH and/or deductions from RH, as an essential part of Wiles' proof of FLT**, then due to this fact alone, as explained above, this has already proved that **Wiles' proof of FLT is FALSE and INVALID, regardless if Jiang or anybody has disproved RH!**

上述情况下, 蒋春暄一旦令人满意地表明在威尔斯对于 FLT 的证明中, 作为威尔斯对于 FLT 证明不可缺少的一部分, 威尔斯包括了 RH 和 / 或 RH 的推论的话, 那么仅由于这一事实, 如上边所解释的那样, 就已经证明威尔斯对于 FLT 的证明错误和无效, 无论蒋春暄或任何人是否已经否定 RH 均如此!

If any mathematician disagrees with this, then please answer this question: If it is acceptable for Wiles to use RH, an unproved hypothesis, to prove FLT, then can Wiles now also to use FLT in reverse to prove the unproved RH? This is obvious ridiculous!

如果任何数学家对此不同意, 那么请回答这样一个问题: 如果能够接受威尔斯使用黎曼假设, 一个未经证明的假说 / 假设, 对费马大定理进行证明的话, 那么由于同样理由, 威尔斯现在是否也可以用费马大定理反过来证明尚未证明的黎曼假设? 这显然荒谬!

The present situation is very similar to the situation described in Andersen's fairy tale "The Emperor's new cloths": Wiles (like those tailors in the fairy tale) has used non-existing "threads" (an unproved hypothesis RH) to weave "the most magnificent new cloths in the world for the Emperor" (Wiles's proof of FLT), and misleads the ministers of the Emperor to believe that only fools can not see and appreciate how magnificent are these new cloths for the Emperor! Although

the ministers can not see the Emperor's new cloths, to avoid being seen as "fools", they all loudly praise the Emperor's new cloths with the magnificent words they could think of in their minds, afraid being considered by others that their appreciation of the Emperor's new cloths are not adequate.

目前的情况非常像安徒生的童话“皇帝的新衣”中的情景：威尔斯（像童话中的裁缝一样）采用“虚假的线”（未经证实的黎曼假设）“为皇帝编织出世界上最为华丽的新衣”（威尔斯对费马大定理的 100 多页的“证明”），并且误导皇帝及其大臣们相信只有傻子才看不见和不能欣赏“皇帝的新衣”多么华丽！尽管大臣们看不见“皇帝的新衣”，为了避免被其它的大臣视为“傻子”，他们异口同声用他们头脑中能够想到的最华丽的词大声称赞“皇帝的新衣”，生怕别人认为他们对皇帝的新衣称赞不足。

However, as Jiang Chun-xuan has now already published his paper **disproving RH**, if Wiles, other overseas mathematicians, or the China Mathematics Society, insists that Wiles' proof of FLT is correct and valid and makes Wiles qualified and entitled to accept the top rewards and glorious remarks awarded to him, and therefore agree the USD1 million Shao Yi-fu Mathematics Award should be presented to Wiles in Sept. 2005, then Wiles, and/or the China Mathematics Society, must hurry and accomplish three mathematical tasks:

然而，由于蒋春暄否定黎曼假设的论文已经发表，如果威尔斯，国外其它的数学家，或者中国数学学会，坚持认为威尔斯对费马大定理的证明是正确与有效的，因此认为威尔斯有资格接受授予给最高奖和显赫的评价的话，并为此同意邵逸夫科学奖基金会在 2005 年 9 月授予威尔斯一百万美元的邵逸夫数学奖的话，那么威尔斯，国外其它的数学家，或者中国数学学会必须抓紧时间完成三项数学任务：

1) Wiles and/or they must first disprove Jiang Chun-xuan's prove of FLT!

1) 威尔斯和 / 或他们必须首先否定蒋春暄对费马大定理的证明！

Note:

注：

In early 1992, and again in 1993, Jiang mailed over 600 copies of preprints of Jiang's proof of FLT to numerous mathematicians in China and the world, including the Princeton University where Wiles worked.

蒋春暄于 1992 年初并再次于 1993 年将 600 多份蒋春暄对于费马大定理的证明的预印本邮寄发给中国与世界无数数学家，包括威尔斯工作的普林斯敦大学。

Date: 2005-08-12

Jiang's proof of FLT was then published in China in March 1992 (Jiang Chun-xuan, Fermat's Last Theorem has been proved, Potential Science, 2, 17-20 (1992)); and later published in English in the USA in 1994 (Jiang Chun-xuan, Algebras, Groups and Geometries, 11, 371-377 (1994)).

蒋春暄对于费马大定理的证明 1992 年 3 月在中国发表 (蒋春暄, 费马大定理已被证明, 潜科学, 2, 17-20 (1992)); 而后于 1994 年在美国以英文出版 (蒋春暄, 代数·群·几何, 11, 371-377 (1994))。

Jiang accomplished all of this was far before Wiles made his final announcement that he has eventually proved FLT in 1995.

蒋春暄实现所有这些远在威尔斯 1995 宣布自己最终证明费马大定理之前。

2) Wiles must also disprove Jiang Chun-xuan's Disproofs of Riemann hypothesis (Jiang Chun-xuan, Algebras, Groups and Geometries, 22, 123-135, 2005)!!

2) 威尔斯和 / 或他们也必须否定蒋春暄对黎曼假设的否定 (蒋春暄, 代数·群·几何, 22, 123-135 (2005))。

3) Wiles and/or they must also prove the Riemann Hypothesis!!!

3) 威尔斯和 / 或他们还必须证明黎曼假设!!!

Failing in any of these three above mentioned mathematical tasks, Wiles and/or they thus can not prove that that Wiles' proof of FLT is correct and valid and therefore can not prove that Wiles is qualified and entitled to accept the top mathematics rewards and glorious remarks awarded to him, Wiles therefore is not qualified and not entitled to receive the USD1 million Shao Yi-fu Mathematics Award to be presented to him personally by Prof. Yang Zhen-ning in Sep. 2005!

未能实现上述这三项数学任务之一, 威尔斯和 / 他们就不能证明威尔斯对费马大定理的证明是正确与有效的, 从而不能证明威尔斯有资格接受授予给他的顶级数学奖和显赫评价, 威尔斯因此没有资格接受 2005 年 9 月将由杨振宁教授亲自授予给威尔斯的一百万美元邵逸夫数学奖。

I hope that Prof. Yang Zhen-ning and other honorable members of the Shao Yi-fu Reward Committing, honorable members of the world mathematic community and the Chinese Mathematics Society, as well as the media, can recognize and agree my above proof and comments on the above issue, or publicly challenge and disprove my above proof and comments on the above issue.

我希望可敬的杨振宁教授与邵逸夫科学奖基金会的其它成员, 尊敬的世界数学界与中国

数学学会的成员，以及新闻媒介，能够认识和同意我关于上述问题的证明与看法，或者能够公开挑战和否定我关于上述问题的证明与看法。

Final Words

后语

In my paper “Healthy & Rapid Development of Chinese Science & Technology, Economy and Society Call for Innovation Achievements Bringing Challenges to Traditional Basic Theories of Science and Technology” published by “**Impact of Science on Society**” (No.2 Issue 2004), a journal of the China Academy of Science, I stated:

在我的文章“中国的科学技术、经济和社会的高速健康发展呼唤挑战传统科学技术基本理论的科技创新成果”（中国科学院的刊物《社会对社会的影响》2004年第2期）我宣称：

- **I consider, those involved in science and technology, irrespective if they are scholars or administrators of science and technology development, the most important, most precious character and morals is “respect facts and tell the truth”, even if such “facts, truth” sometimes are different to the opinion of most other people in the concerned field, and some times even completely different, they must still be able like the little boy in Andersen’s fairy tale “The Emperor’s new cloths”, fearlessly shout out: “But the Emperor is wearing no cloths!”**
- 我认为，搞科学技术的人，无论学者还是科学技术管理者，最重要、最宝贵的品格是“承认事实，讲真话”，即便这种“事实、真话”有时可能与有关领域绝大多数其它人有所不同，甚至针锋相对，也要能够象安徒生童话“皇帝的新衣”中的那个小孩那样，大胆的喊出“皇帝根本没有穿衣服！”

Jiang Chun-xuan’s “Disproof Of Wiles’ Proof For Fermat’s Last Theorem” provides us with another example showing:

蒋春暄的文章“对威尔斯费马大定理证明之否定”向我们提供表明下述情况的又一个例子：

- All and any science hypothesis, until they are fully solid proved by tests, science practice and/or nature, they will always continue only be science hypothesis, and not science truth, regardless how many scholars considers such science hypothesis are correct;
- 所有和任何科学假说，在获得实验、科学实践和 / 或自然界充分可靠的证明之前，它们

始终继续只是科学假说，而不是科学真理，无论多少学者认为这样的科学假设正确；

- All and any further deductions from such science hypothesis, until they are fully solid proved by tests, science practice and/or nature, they are also only science assumptions, and not science truth;
- 这样的科学假说的所有与任何推论，在获得实验、科学实践和 / 或自然界充分可靠的证明之前，它们也仅是科学假设，而不是科学真理；
- All and any such science hypothesis, and all and any of their further deductions, before they are fully solid proved by tests, science practice and/or nature, they are not and can not be used as valid reasons to exclude, reject, denial, suppress and strike new science discoveries, new test results, science and technical achievements and their science practices;
- 因此，所有和任何科学假说，以及这些科学假说所有与任何推论，在获得实验、科学实践和 / 或自然界充分可靠的证明之前，不是也不能作为排斥、拒绝、否定、压制和打击挑战这样的科学假说及其推论的新的科学发现、新的实验结果、科技创新成果及其科学实践的有效理由；
- All and any science disciplines of which basic theories are still based on such science hypothesis and their further deductions, before they are fully solid proved by tests, science practice and/or nature, such science disciplines are still only a collection of science hypothesis and their further deductions, and do not form a science knowledge system of science truth;
- 所有其基本理论依然建立在这样的科学假说及其推论基础上的科学学科，在获得实验、科学实践和 / 或自然界充分可靠的证明之前，这样的学科依然只是一些科学假说及其推论的集合，并不形成科学真理构成的科学知识体系；
- Scholars of such disciplines therefore also should not pretend they have the science right to use their science still not valid “basic theories” to exclude, reject, denial, suppress and strike new science discoveries, new test results, science and technical achievements and their science practices which challenge the basic theories of such disciplines.
- 这样的学科的学者们因而不应当装出他们有科学上的权力使用他们科学上依然并非有效的“基本理论”作为排斥、拒绝、否定、压制和打击挑战这样的科学假说及其推论的新的科学发现、新的实验结果、科技创新成果及其科学实践。

Unfortunately, the above situation still continues in certain science disciplines. This must be

clearly revealed to other fields of the science community, to the middle school and university students, to the media, to the governmental officials, and to the general public. Until such revealment is accomplished, fundamental and essential breakthrough progress can never be achieved within such science disciplines, and the society and people shall continue to suffer substantial losses caused by such unfortunate situations.

遗憾的是，上述情况仍然在某些科学学科继续。应当清楚地将这种情况揭示给科学界其它领域、中学生与大学生、新闻媒介、政府官员以及公众。这样的揭示实现之前，在这样的科学学科中永远不可能实现根本性的实质性的突破性进展，社会与人民将继续遭受这种令人遗憾状况造成的重大损失。

Note:

注：

Chen I-wan, a British-Chinese consultant; living and working in China since 1950; author of “Healthy & Rapid Development of Chinese Science & Technology, Economy and Society Call for Innovation Achievements Bringing Challenges to Traditional Basic Theories of Science and Technology” (No.2 Issue 2004).

陈一文，英籍华人顾问；1950年以来生活和工作在中国；“中国的科学技术、经济和社会的高速健康发展呼唤挑战传统科学技术基本理论的科技创新成果”（中国科学院的刊物《社会对社会的影响》2004年第2期）的作者。

The above paper is available on the Internet in Chinese at:

上述文章可以在互联网上看到：

http://www.chinainfo.gov.cn/data/200408/1_20040824_87030.html

www.ChinaInfo.gov.cn is the website of the China Science & Technology Information Institute of the Ministry of Science of Technology of China.

www.ChinaInfo.gov.cn 是中国科技部中国科学技术信息研究所的网站。